



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,076	10/08/2000	Jonathan Chereff	0544MH-36339	2872
53184 7590 08/18/2005 i2 TECHNOLOGIES US, INC. ONE i2 PLACE, 11701 LUNA ROAD DALLAS, TX 75234			EXAMINER STIMPAK, JOHNNA	
			ART UNIT 3623	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/684,076

Applicant(s)

CHERNEFF ET AL.

Examiner

Johnna R. Stimpak

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-30 and 32-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-30 and 32-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a non-final office action upon examination of application number 09/684,076. Claims 2, 4-30 and 32-45 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Amendments to claims 2, 4, 5, 8-15, 17, 18, 21-28, 30, 32, 33, 36-43 and 45 are acknowledged.
3. Examiner notes that due to further consideration and search, the previously indicated allowable subject matter has been withdrawn. New rejections to the claims are found below.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. It is noted that the combination of Lilly and Dietrich do not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, specifically, this combination does not teach the required resources having an ability level and each task specifying a minimum ability level of one or more resources to be used for that task. Upon further consideration of this limitation, it has been determined that newly cited reference, Fields et al, US 5,111,391, teaches a scheduling system wherein required skill levels for each task are defined and wherein each resource being assigned to the tasks have an associated skill level. The resources (employees) are then assigned to tasks based on the required skill level. New rejections to the claims are found below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 2, 4-30 and 32-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lilly et al, US 5,787,000, in view of Dietrich et al, US 5,548,518, further in view of Fields et al, US 5,111,391.

As per **claim 2**, Lilly et al teaches receiving a list of a plurality of products to be developed (column 3, lines 31-54 – data in received including work order information, defined as a request to manufacture one or more distinct parts); receiving a list of required completion dates, each completion date specifying the completion date for the development of a corresponding product in the plurality of products (column 3, lines 4-15 – work order information specifies a want date for the work order; lines 26-29 – each operation is assigned a finish date/time); receiving, for each product in the plurality of products, a project definition of a project for developing the product, each project definition defining: a plurality of tasks required to complete a project for developing the product associated with the project definition (column 3, lines 14-17 – the operations information includes the identity and sequence of operations to be performed for the work order); and a list of resources required to complete each task defined in the product definition, receiving a list of available resources, each resource in the list of available resources having a capacity as a function of time (column 3, lines 14-17 – operations information includes resources needed; column 7, lines 8-14 – the resources used in the manufacturing

Art Unit: 3623

process are defined as a function of the dates and times in a calendar); and automatically generating a development schedule comprising all tasks for all projects, the development schedule allocating the resources (abstract and column 3, lines 1-47 – a scheduling system for scheduling work orders and resources needed to perform each operation in the work orders).

Lilly et al teaches scheduling a plurality of work orders while including material availability for each material used in the manufacturing process but does not explicitly teach receiving a list of materials available from outside parties distinct from the enterprise and a schedule of availability of the materials available from the outside parties; and the development schedule also scheduling tasks that require materials from outside parties at a time when such materials will be available.

Dietrich teaches a scheduling system wherein an external material availability schedule is used to determine if the material available will meet requirements in scheduling product development (column 3, lines 8-11; column 4, lines 40-45 – material from an external source is used to meet requirements in the product development). Since both Lilly et al and Dietrich teach a scheduling system wherein products are developed according to the availability of materials and resources, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Dietrich's external availability schedule for materials into Lilly et al's scheduling system to account for all materials available to generate a specific product thereby increasing the efficiency of the scheduling system.

The combination of Lilly et al and Dietrich do not explicitly teach the required resources having an ability level and each task specifying a minimum ability level of one or more resources to be used for that task. Fields et al teaches a scheduling system wherein required skill levels for

Art Unit: 3623

each task are defined and wherein each resource being assigned to the tasks have an associated skill level. The resources (employees) are then assigned to tasks based on the required skill level. Since both Lilly et al and Dietrich both teach scheduling systems wherein products are developed according to the availability of materials and resources, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include Fields et al's specification of a skill level for each task and subsequent skill levels of resources (employees) in order to more efficiently allocate each resource to a task. By allocating based on required skill level, each task would be completed by the most qualified resource thereby ensuring highest quality products.

As per **claim 5**, Lilly et al teaches type information identifying the type of task (column 6, lines 1-3 – operations information includes the identity of the operation defined by the work order); hierarchy relationship information comprising one or more pointers to one or more related tasks and information regarding sequence for performing related tasks (column 6, lines 2-3 and 25-50 – the sequence in which the operations are to be performed is defined); duration information specifying a quantity of time the task will take to complete (column 6, lines 8-12 – the period of time needed to perform the operation is defined); resource information specifying one or more resources to be used and a desired ability (column 6, lines 3-10 – identity of resources needed to perform each operation); and progress information specifying progress of the particular task

Lilly et al does not explicitly teach the required resources having an ability level. Fields et al teaches a scheduling system wherein each resource being assigned to the tasks has an associated skill level. The resources (employees) are then assigned to tasks based on the required skill level. Since Lilly et al teaches a scheduling system wherein products are

Art Unit: 3623

developed according to the availability of materials and resources, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include Fields et al's specification of a skill level for each task and subsequent skill levels of resources (employees) in order to more efficiently allocate each resource to a task. By allocating based on required skill level, each task would be completed by the most qualified resource thereby ensuring highest quality products.

As per **claim 6**, Lilly et al teaches one or more constraints associated with a particular task (column 7, lines 8-67 – each resource has a capacity taken in to account when scheduling for a task); and policy information specifying one or more rules for enforcing one or more constraints (column 7, lines 36-67 – the resource capacity calendar is broken in to notches to show resource availability; a shut down notch can be designated representing the manufacturing plant being closed and no resources being utilized).

As per **claim 7**, Lilly et al teaches one or more built-in constraints provided by the scheduler (column 6, lines 25-50 – the linear sequence of operations used to complete a work order are predefined); and one or more user-specified constraints (column 5, lines 55-67 – work order information specifies quantity of the part to be manufactures, want dates, etc., all specified by the user).

As per **claim 8**, Lilly et al teaches a particular task comprises a plurality of subtasks, a task definition for the particular task specifying the plurality of subtasks and an order in which the plurality of subtasks should be performed (column 6, lines 25-50 – the sequence of operations may be single or multiple level; a multiple level work order has a branched sequence of operations whereby each branch contains a subset of operations for manufacturing an intermediate product or subassembly that is used to manufacture the final product).

As per **claim 9**, Lilly et al teaches the plurality of tasks are defined in a hierarchy specifying relationships among related tasks, at least one task comprising a plurality of sub-tasks, each leaf tasks being associated with an identification of one or more resources for performing the leaf task (column 6, lines 25-50 – the sequence of operations may be single or multiple level; a multiple level work order has a branched sequence of operations whereby each branch contains a subset of operations for manufacturing an intermediate product or subassembly that is used to manufacture the final product, these subsets of operations include material requirements).).

As per **claim 10**, Lilly et al teaches a particular task in the plurality of tasks comprises a standard task for repeated use, the method further comprising storing a task definition for the particular task comprising a list of sub-tasks for performing the particular task and a list of resources for performing the sub-tasks in the list of sub-tasks (column 3, lines 1-30 – the computer system stores operations information for each work order to be scheduled including the identity and sequence of operations to be performed for the work order and the identity of the resources needed).

As per **claim 11**, Lilly et al does not explicitly teach monitoring the materials identified in the list of materials from outside parties distinct from the enterprise using one or more supply chain tools operable to monitor the outside parties; and if one or more materials are determined to be unavailable using the one or more supply chain tools, automatically modifying the development schedule based on information obtained by the one or more supply chain tools. Dietrich teaches monitoring the material availability and if there is not sufficient material available, then the available resource will be allocated to the higher priority product and the schedule is changed (column 4, lines 40-45). Since both Lilly et al and Dietrich teach a



Art Unit: 3623

scheduling system wherein products are developed according to the availability of resources, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Dietrich's external availability schedule for materials into Lilly et al's scheduling system to account for all resources available to generate a specific product thereby increasing the efficiency of the scheduling system.

As per **claim 12**, Lilly et al teaches capacity of the resource (column 7, lines 8-67 – each resource has a capacity taken in to account when scheduling for a task); and availability of the resource (column 7, lines 38-67 – the resource capacity calendar shows availability of the resource). Lilly et al does not explicitly teach the required resources having an ability level or competency information indicating how well the resource performs the type of work identified. Fields et al teaches a scheduling system wherein each resource being assigned to the tasks has an associated skill level wherein there is a skill level matrix identifying the highest skill level that can perform the task (inherently a resources skill level would indicate his or her competency level). The resources (employees) are then assigned to tasks based on the required skill level. Since Lilly et al teaches a scheduling system wherein products are developed according to the availability of materials and resources, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include Fields et al's specification of a skill level for each task and subsequent skill levels of resources (employees) in order to more efficiently allocate each resource to a task. By allocating based on required skill level, each task would be completed by the most qualified resource thereby ensuring highest quality products.

As per **claim 13**, Lilly et al teaches the list of available resources is defined in a hierarchy specifying relationships among related resources, at least one resource comprising a plurality of

Art Unit: 3623

sub-resources (column 6, lines 25-50 – the sequence of operations may be single or multiple level; a multiple level work order has a branched sequence of operations whereby each branch contains a subset of operations for manufacturing an intermediate product or subassembly that is used to manufacture the final product).

As per **claim 14**, Lilly et al teaches receiving project status information from a user, the project status information regarding the status of a project in the plurality of projects; and automatically modifying the development schedule based on the project status information (column 9, line 58 – column 10, line 8 – if it is determined that one or more operations in a sequence are delayed, the system reschedules the operations to achieve an optimum schedule).

As per **claim 15**, Lilly et al teaches receiving resource status information from a user, the resource status information regarding the status of available resources in the list of available resources; and automatically modifying the development schedule based on the resource status information (column 9, line 58 – column 10, line 8 – if it is determined that one or more operations in a sequence are delayed by the unavailability of resource capacity, the system reschedules the operations to achieve an optimum schedule).

As per **claim 16**, Lilly et al teaches the resource status information comprises a change in the capacity of a resource (column 9, line 58 – column 10, line 8 – if it is determined that one or more operations in a sequence are delayed by the unavailability of resource capacity, the system reschedules the operations to achieve an optimum schedule).

As per **claim 17**, Lilly et al does not explicitly teach automatically generating the development schedule using a genetic algorithm. However, it is old and well known to use genetic algorithms to solve scheduling problems since genetic algorithms are useful in

Art Unit: 3623

maximizing or minimizing an objective function within a set of constraints, thereby increasing the efficiency of the scheduling system.

**Claims 4 and 18-30** teach the system for performing the method of claims 1, 8-11 and 13-17. Since the combination of Lilly et al, Dietrich and Fields et al teach computer systems for performing scheduling functions, the same rejections as applied to claims 2 and 5-17 also applies to claims 4 and 18-30.

**Claims 32-45** teach the software embodied in a computer-readable medium that is executed to perform the method of claims 1, 8-11 and 13-17. Since the combination of Lilly et al, Dietrich and Fields et al teach computer systems and software for performing scheduling functions, the same rejections as applied to claims 2 and 5-17 also applies to claims 4 and 18-30.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yuri et al, US 6,249,715 – method and apparatus for optimizing work distribution

Lesaint et al, US 6,578,005 – method and apparatus for resource allocation when schedule changes are incorporated in real time

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnna R. Stimpak whose telephone number is 571-272-6736.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS

8/15/05

*Susanna M. Diaz*  
**SUSANNA M. DIAZ**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*AU 3623*